

From: Flybyfrye@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:45 AM
Subject: media consolidation

How can you dare consider pushing sweeping changes in media ownership rules without adequate public debate. Is this to be one more thing slipped past the public while eyes are on Iraq? It is an outrage.

Fay Russell
Los Angeles, CA
(323)6441616

From: Andrew McLaughlin
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:45 AM
Subject: deregulation

There is a vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If adopted, this will put control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Our democracy depends on an independent media. Please carefully consider your responsibilities to all the American people.

Thank you -- Professor Andrew McLaughlin

From: Thom Hartmann
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: deregulation

Please do not further weaken the already feeble ability our democratic republic has to regulate powerful corporations in their control of the media.

Please also consider reinstating mandatory rules for radio and TV broadcasters to carry both sides of political debates. This would be so vital to democracy.

Best regards,

Thomas Hartmann
41 Northfield St.
Montpelier, VT 05602

From: bonniejihanna@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:55 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Hanna
307 Henry Street
Fairview, New Jersey 07022-2010

From: Willie Wisely
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 2:02 PM
Subject: FCC Vote

Dear Commissioner:

Please DO NOT vote to further deregulate the corporate media. The nature of the present "News" industry is biased toward violence, fear and war. Because most Americans are peaceful, loving happy people I urge you to not consider consolidating media oligopolies even further as it has proved too easy for the White House and the Pentagon to turn these larger corporate feeds into GOVERNMENT propoganda feeds, that misinform our democracy. For democracy to thrive we need "transparent" information.

News coverage has celebrated this war in Iraq, polling questions are slanted toward supporting war, and corporate interests, the firms that drive media conglomerates, depend on war. Please do not encourage this power structure in America. WE need many diverse news sources, representing every type of viewpoint in America. More deregulation is a threat to our FREEDOM, contrary to the supposed "FREEDOM" motive that the current administration in Washington is using to justify their illegal war.

William Wisely
Los Angeles, CA 90069

From: j
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 2:24 PM
Subject: Media giants

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Joy Freiberg
CA

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: GESSERIT@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 2:37 PM
Subject: FCC vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,
Kathleen Balfe

From: Mark Gould
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 3:25 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Media Ownership Limits - DO NOT Remove Remaining Regulatory Limits on Corporations

Mark Gould
268 Joost Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94131

April 21, 2003

Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Michael Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Powell:

The FCC must NOT further weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

The FCC is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal of or further modification to these rules will likely open the door to more mergers that will continue to reduce competition and diversity in the media. If the rules are weakened further, one company in a city could control the most popular newspaper, TV station and possibly the cable system, giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of news and information. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in this country. Media ownership would be concentrated by corporate monopolies even further, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with diverse viewpoints would be compromised.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA, I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,

Mark Gould

From: Williams, Susie (BETV)
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 7:37 PM
Subject: June Vote

April 21, 2003

Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC

Dear Chairman Powell:

In light of your upcoming vote in June to determine whether the FCC should alter the current regulations preventing ownership of multiple forms of media by the same owner, I would seriously urge you to NOT make any changes to the current rules that would allow or encourage large conglomerates to gobble up any more independent stations or news agencies. Loosening the rules any further would allow nothing short of the creation of news monopolies in this country, which would seriously jeopardize the very foundation of both freedom of speech and press. When any conglomerate buys up enough percentage of multiple media formats, they control no less than the public mind and dissemination of information in the very broadest sense. This can only lead to dictating one-sided viewpoints and threatening, if not eliminating, the equal opportunity for free expression of dissent by those who oppose the views of the controlling conglomerate or its highest bidder. That much power has historically proven, repeatedly, to inevitably lead to abuse and corruption, especially when there are no checks and balances. It won't be a matter of IF, but WHEN our precious public freedom of information and truth in reporting will be in the control of totalitarian news dictators. With that much power and control, selection of candidates and our very election process would be horrendously threatened. And that would only be the beginning, and for all intents and purposes, the beginning of our end.

This country owes its very existence to a group of dissenters. We need fair reporting of diverse viewpoints in order for all ideas to be expressed equally and to guarantee the democratic process. Dissenters have been our conscience in the past. They have made us stop and rethink our viewpoints and some have helped put the brakes on extreme viewpoints gone wild. Having a dissenting viewpoint doesn't make your opinion wrong, any more than sharing the viewpoint of the majority, makes you right. Our diversity and our equal expression of it, is what make us great.

We've already seen some selective news censorship in recent weeks during the Gulf War. Ironical when you think about it, since we ostensibly went to Iraq to help stop this very type of abuse. If this tendency already exists now, less restriction by the FCC will only serve to open the doors to more flagrant abuse by powerful conglomerates if they are allowed to swallow up even more media outlets. Our independent news organizations help keep us honest and fair-minded. For the FCC to undermine the continued existence of these independent organizations and our freedoms, would be a tragic disservice to this country, its citizens and our democratic ideals.

Whatever claims these huge, powerful conglomerates might have made to your

commission regarding what potential benefits they can provide to the public if they are allowed further acquisitions of more media outlets, I fear any benefit will be brief, insignificant, and of short duration. The only benefit these powerful companies are interested in is their own power, control and bottom line. Any interest these conglomerates claim to have in benefiting the public would only serve as a means to an end, an end that would benefit the conglomerates the most, not the public.

Please, I strongly urge you to think very carefully before you make any decisions that will, in effect, create a long term media environment characterized by a loss of accountability and conscience, and a genuine threat to our constitutional rights of free speech and a free press.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Sincerely,

S. E. Williams
12707 Murphy Rd., #70
Stafford, TX 77477-3096
Email: sewillia@bechtel.com

From: Williams, Susie (BETV)
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 7:39 PM
Subject: FCC June Vote

April 21, 2003

Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

In light of your upcoming vote in June to determine whether the FCC should alter the current regulations preventing ownership of multiple forms of media by the same owner, I would seriously urge you to NOT make any changes to the current rules that would allow or encourage large conglomerates to gobble up any more independent stations or news agencies. Loosening the rules any further would allow nothing short of the creation of news monopolies in this country, which would seriously jeopardize the very foundation of both freedom of speech and press. When any conglomerate buys up enough percentage of multiple media formats, they control no less than the public mind and dissemination of information in the very broadest sense. This can only lead to dictating one-sided viewpoints and threatening, if not eliminating, the equal opportunity for free expression of dissent by those who oppose the views of the controlling conglomerate or its highest bidder. That much power has historically proven, repeatedly, to inevitably lead to abuse and corruption, especially when there are no checks and balances. It won't be a matter of IF, but WHEN our precious public freedom of information and truth in reporting will be in the control of totalitarian news dictators. With that much power and control, selection of candidates and our very election process would be horrendously threatened. And that would only be the beginning, and for all intents and purposes, the beginning of our end.

This country owes its very existence to a group of dissenters. We need fair reporting of diverse viewpoints in order for all ideas to be expressed equally and to guarantee the democratic process. Dissenters have been our conscience in the past. They have made us stop and rethink our viewpoints and some have helped put the brakes on extreme viewpoints gone wild. Having a dissenting viewpoint doesn't make your opinion wrong, any more than sharing the viewpoint of the majority, makes you right. Our diversity and our equal expression of it, is what make us great.

We've already seen some selective news censorship in recent weeks during the Gulf War. Ironical when you think about it, since we ostensibly went to Iraq to help stop this very type of abuse. If this tendency already exists now, less restriction by the FCC will only serve to open the doors to more flagrant abuse by powerful conglomerates if they are allowed to swallow up even more media outlets. Our independent news organizations help keep us honest and fair-minded. For the FCC to undermine the continued existence of these independent organizations and our freedoms, would be a tragic disservice to this country, its citizens and our democratic ideals.

Whatever claims these huge, powerful conglomerates might have made to your

commission regarding what potential benefits they can provide to the public if they are allowed further acquisitions of more media outlets, I fear any benefit will be brief, insignificant, and of short duration. The only benefit these powerful companies are interested in is their own power, control and bottom line. Any interest these conglomerates claim to have in benefiting the public would only serve as a means to an end, an end that would benefit the conglomerates the most, not the public.

Please, I strongly urge you to think very carefully before you make any decisions that will, in effect, create a long term media environment characterized by a loss of accountability and conscience, and a genuine threat to our constitutional rights of free speech and a free press.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Sincerely,

S. E. Williams
12707 Murphy Rd., #70
Stafford, TX 77477-3096
Email: sewillia@bechtel.com

From: Cathi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 8:20 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Dear Commissioner:

This is to advise you that I am opposed to further consolidation of media ownership. We are seeing a collapse of the free press in this country and it needs to be stopped!

C M Lowery
Vancouver, WA
clowery@pacifier.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Cathi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 8:20 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Dear Commissioner:

This is to advise you that I am opposed to further consolidation of media ownership. We are seeing a collapse of the free press in this country and it needs to be stopped!

C M Lowery
Vancouver, WA
clowery@pacifier.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Cathi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 8:20 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Dear Commissioner:

This is to advise you that I am opposed to further consolidation of media ownership. We are seeing a collapse of the free press in this country and it needs to be stopped!

C M Lowery
Vancouver, WA
clowery@pacifier.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Melvin Mackey
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 8:38 PM
Subject: Further Deregulation Bad for the United States

Commissioners,

I understand there is a vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further, this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few. The American public needs exposure to many points of view.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied and the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and a continuing decline of our democracy. Please use due caution.

Thank you,

Melvin Mackey
24430 Old Mill Rd SW
Vashon, Washington 98070

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: Clark Najac
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:26 PM
Subject: deregulation vote June 2

Dear Mr. Powell,

I cannot tell you how alarmed I am at the prospect of having fewer rather than more points of view expressed in this country. Even though the rich have always had the upper hand when it came to anything happening in our wonderful country, it seems that fewer of the rich now care about the welfare of the poorer citizens. To deliberately make expression of varied points of view more difficult is truly criminal especially since to allow these views could only make things ultimately better for us all. I would actually like you and the board to reconsider this matter. Our country has encouraged diversity of opinion. The expense in dollars is far less than the expense in truth and fairness would be. Please consider where we would all be today if only one, or even five, points of view had been allowed to exist!

Sincerely, Stiles M. Najac, 170 King Road, Middletown, New York, 10941

From: susank2@cox.net
To: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 11:30 PM
Subject: FCC Single Vote

Parents Television council alerted me that the 6900 complaints that came through for the Victoria Secret show was counted as one vote. I am astonished by this logic. The 6900 complaints were just that, 6900 separate complaints. Please stop playing around with these complaints and take them seriously. My understanding is that the FCC is supposed to uphold the Federal Decency laws and I don't see that happening.

02-277

From: bethlillian@juno.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJM, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 11:06 AM
Subject: upcoming FCC vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Beth Ribet

02.277

From: Susan Mullins
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:40 PM
Subject: FW: media conglomeration

From: Susan Mullins <mullsr@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2003 15:32:11 -0400
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Subject: media conglomeration

We feel we must vociferously protest the media conglomeration in this country and would like to share with you the views we have sent on to the TV companies! We also want the break-up of the companies that are in existence, if all they can provide the "cleaned up", "state" messages they have heretofore been providing.

"We feel the kind of news coverage coming from the TV and the "slant" of its shows has failed the American public, abysmally.

I read about the results of agent orange on Vietnam War Vets' children in April, 2001; when I was going through chemotherapy. This was easy to connect since my father was a chemist at Diamond Alkalai in Newark in 1945 - manufacturing agent orange! Within a very short time, all the members of his division were dead from cancer. His children before 1945 are fine, but I was born after.

To not tell Americans of the after effects of depleted uranium on both Iraqis and THEIR OWN CHILDREN, is criminal. We have not been able to stomach or tolerate your news casts. Please share the dark side of what we are doing. It is truly your duty to your countrymen and YOUR OWN LIVES! The current statistics are 4.5 out of 10 Americans can expect to have to deal with cancer in their lifetime.

Why is the money we are spending not considered? We are "begging" ourselves into what that truly infamous spokesman, Michael Savage, calls "turd" world nation status! How does it happen that Halliburton gets \$7 BILLION for stopping fires in Iraq (fires that are already "capped"!) when some area of the country are going to 4 day school weeks to save 20% on teachers' salaries? Why are library hours being drastically reduced, yet we have money for DynCorp to go into Iraq with "questionable" operations? The TV should be reporting on these matters!

Please do not make the TV a curious artifact in our home. Return it to a source of information and entertainment we can respect. It would be the most "patriotic" thing you could do if the truth were told!"

Sincerely,
Susan Mullins
Richard Mullins

From: James Embree
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:15 PM
Subject: Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Powell:

As a consumer of media in various forms, newspaper, TV, radio, etc., I am following with interest your pursuit of rule changes concerning ownership of TV and newspapers in the same market. Recent articles suggest publishers and others who own both newspapers and TV stations are making the case that because there are so many more choices for consumers now, ie satellite, cable etc. that the rules should be relaxed.

I would tend to agree if not for the fact that broadcasters (NAB) fight tooth and nail to bar the delivery of distant network signals by capable distribution channels (satellite). If I am only allowed local channels, what extra choice do I have? Should the same company own a TV station, newspaper and web site or radio station in the same market, even with all the various delivery choices I may have, my overall choice will be reduced.

Should you decide to relax cross-ownership rules, I strongly suggest you also consider relaxing rules related to distant network availability, particularly as it relates to satellite, and allow consumers real choice instead of consolidation of editorial and marketing strength.

Sincerely,

James Embree

James Embree
Las Vegas, Nevada

From: Thomas Blaney
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:45 AM
Subject: horrified

I am horrified at how the broadcast media is becoming homogenized and "sanitized" by ownership of fewer and fewer interests. A democracy cannot survive without a robust diversity of perspectives getting equal exposure.

Thomas Blaney
Oklahoma City

From: Earl Alexander
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 12:35 PM
Subject: upcoming FCC vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,